

**Tracer Study Report: IDRC-Sponsored Participation in
the International Program for Development Evaluation
Training (IPDET)**

October 16, 2006

Evaluation Unit, IDRC

Table of Contents

Tracer Study Report: IDRC-Sponsored Participation in the International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET)	1
List of Acronyms.....	3
Executive Summary	4
A. Objective of the Study.....	7
B. Intended User (s) and Use of the Tracer Study	8
i. User:	8
ii. Uses:.....	8
II. Methodology, Limitations and Profile of Awardees Interviewed.....	8
A. Methodology	8
B. Limitations and Risks.....	9
C. Profile of IDRC-Sponsored IPDET Participants Surveyed.....	9
III. Findings.....	10
A. 2001-2005 IPDET Participants (IDRC Staff and Partners)	10
i. Overview:.....	10
ii. By Question:	11
B. IPDET Participants (IDRC partners), 2006	19
i. Overview:.....	19
ii. By Question:	19
C. IDRC Staff Sponsors of IPDET, 2001-2006	22
i. Overview:.....	22
ii. By Question:	22
IV. Conclusions and Recommendations	26
V. APPENDICES.....	29
APPENDIX A: Contributors	30
APPENDIX B: IDRC-Sponsored IPDET Participants.....	31
APPENDIX C: Letter sent to IDRC-Sponsored IPDET Participants, 2001-2005.....	32
APPENDIX D: Letter Sent to IDRC Sponsors, 2001-2006.....	33
APPENDIX E: Survey for IDRC-Sponsored IPDET Participants, 2001-2005	34
APPENDIX F: Survey Response for IDRC-Sponsored IPDET Participants, 2001-2005	37
APPENDIX G: Survey for IDRC-Sponsored IPDET Participants, 2006	52
APPENDIX H: Survey Response for IDRC-Sponsored IPDET Participants, 2006	54
APPENDIX I: Survey for IDRC Sponsors.....	57
APPENDIX J: Survey Results for IDRC Sponsors.....	59

List of Acronyms

AEA	American Evaluation Association
CAF	Corporate Assessment Framework
CES	Canadian Evaluation Society
EU	Evaluation Unit (IDRC)
ICT	Information and Communication Technologies
ICT4D	Information and Communication Technologies for Development
IDEAS	International Development Association Society
IPDET	International Program for Development Evaluation Training
IDRC	International Development Research Centre
LACRO	IDRC Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
OM	Outcome Mapping
RBM	Results Based Management
RBMES	Results Based Management and Evaluation System
SARO	IDRC Regional Office for South Asia
WARO	IDRC Regional Office for West and Central Africa

Executive Summary

The International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET) is designed to meet the professional development needs of audit development professionals as well as senior and mid-level evaluation and working in developing country governments, bilateral and multilateral development agencies, and non-governmental organizations. Since 2001, the IDRC Evaluation Unit has sponsored 53 people to attend the program. Participants have included IDRC staff and project partners who were sponsored by IDRC Program Officers and Research Officers.

Recognizing the Centre's aim to build the evaluation capacity of partners and staff, this tracer study was designed to determine whether IPDET is the best method of building this capacity. Three groups of individuals were interviewed and/or surveyed for the study:

- IDRC-sponsored staff and partners who participated in IPDET from 2001-2005;
- IDRC-sponsored partners¹ who participated in the 2006 IPDET training.
- IDRC staff who sponsored IDRC staff or partners to attend IPDET training from 2001-2005.

Overall, the study found the IPDET program to be an effective way for IDRC partners and staff to build their evaluation capacity. The program was found by many respondents to be a 'one-stop-shop,' providing a range of evaluation methodologies in one place. The majority of IDRC-sponsored participants stated that the IPDET program had either moderate or great influence over their work, organization and career – though respondents noted the strongest influence to have been on their individual work, and to a lesser degree on their careers and their organizations. IDRC-sponsored participants were very pleased with the profile of the instructors, who were practitioners with theoretical background. Most surveyed participants stated that they returned to their organizations and implemented their new knowledge and skills in evaluation into projects. Although the course is one focused on capacity building and evaluation, networking was an additional aspect of significance to all participants surveyed.

Most respondents stated that they did not encounter many difficulties in applying their newfound skills, although they noted that the concepts themselves were indeed challenging. An important finding that emerged from the study is that participants did not necessarily require additional formal evaluation training in order to apply their new skills effectively. About half of participants interviewed stated that they pursued further evaluation training after the IPDET program; however, those that did not attend such trainings applied their skills to the same extent in their workplaces as those who went on to further training. Some participants also noted that the training itself was helpful in preparing them to foresee and/or address some of the challenges they might encounter when applying these skills. It should be noted, however, that since some attendees had received other evaluation training, it was difficult to attribute these results solely to the IPDET course.

¹ Due to the time constraints of this study, interviews were not conducted with IDRC staff who attended the 2006 training.

All surveyed groups found networking to be a very important outcome of the training. Participants used the IPDET listserv and informal communication methods to maintain strong links and support networks with each other after the program. Networking contributed to the sustainability of the participants' capacity building, and also helped build working relationships and future collaborations. For instance, participants from various regions, including Southern Africa and Southeast Asia, said that they kept in regular contact with fellow IPDET participants in their region (through monthly meetings), or cross-regionally (through e-mail). While networking was found to be a significant outcome of the training by the majority of interviewees, it was not identified as an area that IDRC had actively supported following trainings.

While overall, participants had positive comments on IPDET, there were also a number of mixed views on its format and content. Some felt that four weeks was long for training; however, others thought this timeframe allowed them to get a broad overview as well as some specific skills in evaluation. Surveyed participants found the core course provided the broader overview, while the workshops offered more specialized training. Some of the respondents found the course to cover too many methodologies without providing sufficient details about each; others instead felt this provided them with a strong basis in evaluation methodologies. Several participants critiqued the program for having too much of a "World Bank focus," and was not offering other approaches. Another critique was that the training did not allow for enough specificity of focus on individual projects, as they felt other trainings, such as Outcome Mapping (OM) trainings, provide.

A number of interviewees recommended more IDRC follow-up evaluation support to enrich their training and learning experience. It is interesting to note that many who identified challenges or problems in applying their evaluation skills often identified this lack of support or of an evaluation culture within their own institution. IDRC-sponsored project partners participating in IPDET were also not always familiar with IDRC staff, beyond their individual sponsors, prior to 2006.² Follow-up networking support would be a key way that the EU could enrich the training experience. Sharing participants' lists and encouraging opportunities for all IDRC sponsors and IDRC-sponsored partners to meet (as happened in 2006), would be two ways IDRC could facilitate networking with minimal input. IDRC could also consider asking that, as part of the scholarship, partners' institutions allocate time for the participant, once returned from the training, to discuss the training with fellow colleagues and build others' evaluation capacity.

However, one of the challenges to IDRC providing more in-depth follow up and support to awardees is the additional staff time it would demand of IDRC personnel. An additional challenge in this area is in the identification of individuals within IDRC who should or could provide such follow-up (i.e. EU staff or IDRC sponsors). Sponsors seem to be in an ideal role to conduct such follow-up support because they have a direct link with IDRC-sponsored participants and are working interactively with them. However, sponsors noted not having the time, and sometimes not having the evaluation capacity themselves, to do this. Meanwhile, such follow-up also falls outside the scope or mandate of the EU, and would also place strains on their staff capacity. In order to

² In 2006, IDRC's approach to bring all awardees together during the training, along with all of the IDRC sponsors and some EU staff. This seemed to strengthen networking between participants and IDRC personnel, although it is too soon to confirm this.

address the lack of time that Program Officers have to conduct such follow-up, one of suggestions made by an IDRC staff interviewee was that perhaps an outside consultant could be hired to conduct such follow-up. However, not having had an ongoing relationship with the partner or the project on which they work would be an obstacle to outside consultants.

One way to counteract the obstacles related to location and language is to have the participating partner's institution make a commitment to allow the IPDET participant to engage in capacity building with other in their organization, including those who could not attend for language reasons. Another way to address this challenge could be to establish evaluation nodes within IDRC's institutional partners in each region.

Is IPDET the best form of delivery for building the evaluation capacity of IDRC partners? While some sponsors questioned the cost-effectiveness of the program, overall, interviewees felt this was an effective method for building their evaluation capacity. Given the lack of comprehensive evaluation trainings available to IDRC partners around the globe, the IPDET program is identified as a good way for the EU to continue to support its partners and staff. While the core program is more useful to individuals with little or no experience in evaluation, the workshops may be of greater use to people with some evaluation background. Respondents also felt a greater focus on OM within the IPDET curriculum would be very valuable. The EU could also continue to provide a briefing or networking meeting, as was done in 2006, to provide IDRC-sponsored participants with a solid understanding of the EU, its resources and its mandate.

I. Introduction

The International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET) is designed to build the evaluative capacity of senior and mid-level evaluation and audit development professionals working in bilateral and multilateral development agencies, non-governmental organizations, or developing country governments. The International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET) is designed to meet the professional development needs of audit development professionals as well as senior and mid-level evaluation and working in developing country governments, bilateral and multilateral development agencies, and non-governmental organizations. Since 2001, the IDRC Evaluation Unit has sponsored 53 people to attend the program IPDET consists of two consecutive components: 1) a two-week Core Course providing development evaluation basics; and 2) a series of 28 freestanding workshops over two weeks providing more in-depth of knowledge on specific topics in development evaluations. Since 2001, the IDRC Evaluation Unit has sponsored 53 people to attend IPDET³.

Recognizing the Centre's aim to build the evaluation capacity of partners and staff, this tracer study was designed to determine whether IPDET is the best method of building this capacity. Three groups of individuals were interviewed and/or surveyed for the study:

- IDRC-sponsored staff and partners who participated in IPDET from 2001-2005;
- IDRC-sponsored partners⁴ who participated in the 2006 IPDET training;
- IDRC staff who sponsored IDRC staff or partners to attend IPDET training from 2001-2005.

A. Objective of the Study

Recognizing the Centre's aim to build the evaluation capacity of partners and staff, this tracer study was designed to determine whether IPDET is the best method of building this capacity. The general objective of this evaluation is to assess IPDET in building the evaluative capacities of IDRC-sponsored participants. The results of this study will help improve IDRC's continued support to evaluation building.

More specifically, the objectives are:

- To explore how the skills and knowledge acquired at IPDET by IDRC staff and partners have influenced their work, organization and career;
- To explore the role of the IPDET Program in supporting participants evaluation career development;
- To determine how networks and the use of the IPDET listserv has influenced individuals' careers;
- To determine if this evaluation capacity building through IPDET is sustainable for IDRC-sponsored individuals;
- To generate lessons for the Evaluation Unit's procedures with IDRC-sponsored IPDET participants.

³ For more information, consult the IPDET site at <http://www.ipdet.org/>.

⁴ Due to the time constraints of this study, interviews were not conducted with IDRC staff who attended the 2006 training.

B. Intended User (s) and Use of the Tracer Study

i. User:

- IDRC Evaluation Unit;
- IDRC Program Area Staff.

ii. Uses:

- To determine whether or not IPDET is an effective way of building evaluation capacity for IDRC-sponsored participants (staff and partners);
- To determine how to improve the support to future IDRC-sponsored IPDET participants.

II. Methodology, Limitations and Profile of Awardees Interviewed

A. Methodology

The survey interview was the key methodological tool in this study. Three versions of the survey were developed, targeting each of the identified interviewee group⁵:

- IDRC-sponsored staff and partners who participated in IPDET from 2001-2005: 24 individuals surveyed;⁶
- IDRC-sponsored partners⁷ who participated in the 2006 IPDET training, 4 individuals surveyed;⁸
- IDRC staff who sponsored IDRC staff or partners to attend IPDET training from 2001-2005: 8 interviewees.⁹

Questions for IDRC-sponsored IPDET participants from 2001-2005 covered a range of issues, including: background of the participant, and reasons for their enrolment in the course; work history and any career changes since attendance in the IPDET training; how participants have applied or used skills obtained during IPDET; whether participants developed supports and networks during IPDET; how evaluative capacities have been enriched since the training; and overall recommendations.

Questions for the 2006 IDRC-sponsored participants were tailored to assess their initial reactions to the training and the kinds of strategies that they expect to use to apply their IPDET skills, as not enough time had elapsed to observe the longer-term results.

⁵ Twenty (20) of the 2001-2005 IDRC-sponsored participants did not respond, or correct contact information for these awardees was not obtained. Five IDRC-sponsored staff participating in the 2006 program were not included for interviews due to the time constraints of this study.

⁶ Results for this surveyed group are accurate within a margin of error of $\pm 9.1\%$ at a 90% confidence level, and a margin of error of $\pm 10.8\%$ with a 95% confidence level.

⁷ Due to the time constraints of this study, interviews were not conducted with IDRC staff who attended the 2006 training.

⁸ This group is too small to establish statistical representation.

⁹ Results for this surveyed group are accurate within a margin of error of $\pm 13\%$ at a 90% confidence level.

Questions for IDRC staff who sponsored participants covered topics such as: Staff experiences with the IPDET program and the evaluation capacity of participants following the training; EU support to participants; and overall recommendations.

In most cases, interviews were conducted by phone and in person. In some cases, an electronic survey via the Internet was used. Copies of the letters of intent and survey guidelines sent to awardees are included in the appendices of this report, along with the list of interviewees and complete survey data.

B. Limitations and Risks

- For the IPDET participants (IDRC staff and partners) from 2001-2005, a language barrier was a factor in some telephone interviews.
- For the IDRC partners that participated in the 2006 IPDET training, the surveys did not allow for elaborated responses.
- Some interviewees had received previous evaluation training; it is therefore a challenge to assign attribution of impacts to the IPDET training.

C. Profile of IDRC-Sponsored IPDET Participants Surveyed

Table 1: The Year of IPDET Participation					
2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006
0 (2 staff)	0	7 (2 staff)	9*	6 (1 staff)	9(5staff)
=2	=0	=7	=9	=6	=14

**One participant participated in both 2004 and 2005.*

Table 2: Gender of Participants Interviewed	
Male: 16 (48%)	Female: 17 (52%)

Table 3 :Country of Citizenship at the time of IPDET	
Palestine Ghana Ecuador Philippines Egypt Senegal Czech Republic Bangladesh Uganda Colombia	India Canada South Africa Indonesia Kenya Mexico Argentina Uruguay Chile Malaysia

IDRC has sent individual participants from 20 different countries to attend the IPDET program. The IDRC-sponsored partners to IPDET are mostly from developing countries.

Table 4: Length of attendance at IPDET ¹⁰	
2 week core course	<i>14 individuals surveyed</i>
2 week core and 1 week workshop	<i>3 individuals surveyed</i>
1 or 2 week workshops	<i>1 individuals surveyed</i>
Entire 4 weeks*	<i>15 individuals surveyed</i>

III. Findings

A. 2001-2005 IPDET Participants (IDRC Staff and Partners)

i. Overview:

The majority of awardees stated that the IPDET program had either moderate or great influence over their work, organization and career – though respondents noted the strongest influence to have been on their individual work, and to a lesser degree on their careers and their organizations. While most participants (58%) were directly involved in evaluation prior to the training, 67% of the individuals surveyed in this group have stated that they have become more involved in evaluation since attending the course – some of whom noted that this was a direct result of the training program.

A number of the IDRC-sponsored participants interviewed provided concrete examples of how they had applied the skills learned during IPDET, noting that the course had also prepared them to address any challenges or difficulties they might encounter in applying these skills. However, some interviewees identified challenges related to a lack of support or culture of evaluation within their institutional environments. While most attendees did not know of colleagues who had attended the IPDET trainings but felt that in most cases, training more than one staff person would be beneficial. Forty-two (42%) received further training, such as Outcome Mapping (OM) and Results-Based Management (RBM) training, and generally stated that this training was highly complimentary to the IPDET program.

The development of networks and communications amongst alumni was a clearly beneficial outcome of the training, with the majority of interviewees either using the IPDET listserv (75%) or engaging in other networks (85%) with fellow IPDET alumni following the program. “Exchange of information” was seen to be the most common result of this increased networking and communicating (71%), with half of the participants stating it led to “brainstorming, exchange of ideas on projects” and 21% stating that they had engaged in “collaborative work on a specific project or activity” with fellow awardees following the training. The large majority did not establish relationships or connections with other IDRC staff or partners (who did not attend the training) as a result of the training.

Overwhelmingly, all but one of the individuals surveyed said they would recommend the program to other researchers and those working in international development. Similarly, all individuals surveyed were very positive about the support they received from the

¹⁰ Two participants attended the core one year and subsequently returned for the workshops the following year.

Evaluation Unit in taking the program, though some recommendations were made for future support to IPDET awardees. These recommendations included:

- That more opportunities be provided for IDRC-sponsored partners to meet with IDRC staff, and observe or be involved in the evaluation of IDRC projects;
- That additional guidance be provided by the EU on what workshops to take;
- That a Seeds Fund be established to support small evaluation projects following the training; and
- That the EU provide a briefing prior to the course that includes an overview of the work and role of the EU and a de-brief afterwards, aimed at capturing experiences and lessons learned.

ii. By Question:

a) Background

Question 2) How have the skills, knowledge you acquired at IPDET influenced your work, your organization and your career?

Table 5: 2) How have the skills, knowledge you acquired at IPDET influenced your work, your organization and your career. (N=24)				
Questions	No influence	Little influence	Moderate influence	Great influence
Your work		13% N=3	46% N=11	41% N=10
Your organization		21% N=5	66% N=16	13% N=3
Your career		21% N=5	38% N=9	41% N=3

Participants were asked using a scale from “no influence” to “great influence” to rate how the skills and knowledge they acquired at IPDET have influenced their work, their organization and their career. When asked about the influence of IPDET on their work, 46% of participants indicated that the program had a moderate influence on their work. With regard to the influence on their organization 66% identified a moderate influence. 41% of respondents identified that IPDET had been a great influence on their career. Overall the participants ranked the level of influence between moderate and great influence.

Question 3) Why did you participate in the IPDET training?

“No one within the project had the experience and we needed to build capacity within the project and thought the training would be important.”

Seventeen percent (17%) of IDRC-sponsored participants stated that they had no previous evaluation skills. Seventy-nine percent (79%) of the participants went to IPDET in order to improve their evaluation skills or to gain experience in specific methodologies, and 8% went for Outcome Mapping training. The surveyed participants acknowledged that IPDET has a good reputation for offering a wide range

of evaluation skills in both qualitative and quantitative methodologies. Most IDRC-sponsored participants were sent by IDRC as part of a project that required the evaluation expertise. The importance of training for institutionalizing monitoring and

evaluation for their organization or government department was also recognized. Some participants surveyed also highlighted the need to offer evaluation expertise.

Question 4) When you first attended IPDET, were you directly involved in evaluation activities with your organization? (Yes or No)

Fifty-eight percent (58%) of surveyed participants responded were directly involved in evaluation activities with their respective organizations prior to IPDET, including 21% who stated that they were directly involved in using OM within their projects. Thirty-three percent (33%) of surveyed participants indicated that they were indirectly involved with evaluations within their organizations. Only one individual surveyed stated that their organization was not involved in evaluation or that they only had external evaluators.

Table 6 4a) What best described your role or position at that time?
IDRC staff: Research Officer, Intern, Professional Development Awardee.
Program/ Project Coordinator
Researcher: Associate, Consultant
Project Manager/Project Officer

Question 4b) Have you changed jobs or organizations since attending IPDET?

Sixty-seven percent (67%) of participants have changed jobs or organizations since attending IPDET. Twenty-nine percent (29%) have been promoted within their own organizations or are now working for new organizations. Other surveyed participants stated that while they remained in the same position, they have more responsibilities and are more involved in evaluation. Thirteen percent (13%) have had a career changes and are no longer working in international development.

Question 4c) If you changed jobs or organizations since attending IPDET, are you now more or less involved in evaluation activities?

Sixty-seven percent (67%) of surveyed participants indicated that they were now more involved or have more responsibility in evaluation activities within their projects since attending IPDET.

The 13% who are no longer working in international development but have applied their evaluation skills in other to other fields, including integrating evaluation into the teachings of a Masters program and life coaching.

"I am now more involved in evaluation activities and have a wider scope for development evaluation concerns. From project level monitoring and evaluation, my role has been elevated to sector level concerns on strategic planning, monitoring and evaluation in forestry."

"I am continually involved with evaluation. I now have additional skills and have made the effort to apply skills and networks I created, including evaluation design."

Twenty-five percent (25%) of participants indicated that they have not increased or decreased involvement in evaluation activities since attending IPDET. Most have continued to be involved in working in evaluation; however, they are now conducting more varied types of evaluation, have more responsibility, including coordinating evaluations, and are active participants in evaluation networks. The remaining 8% of participants who indicated that they are less involved in evaluation activities since attending IPDET have stated reasons including going back to school and having a complete career change.

4d) How would you describe your change in role and to what extent do you think the change was influenced by your attendance at IPDET?

Fifty-four percent (54%) of participants stated that IPDET had a direct influence in changing their role at work. Another twenty-nine percent (29%) stated that IPDET had some influence in developing their skills, although, it was difficult to attribute it directly to IPDET.

"I have increased knowledge and networks and now I hope to move into evaluation full time. IPDET was a strong factor in the change in career path."

b) Applying your Skills

Question 5) Do you have an example of a contribution you have made to an evaluation project or activity since your IPDET training?

"I have helped teach my colleagues and other organizations about basic evaluation skills and building evaluation capacity."

The majority of participants have applied their evaluation skills learned at IPDET and other previous trainings.¹¹ Thirty-three percent (33%) of the participants described their ability to combine their previous Outcome Mapping knowledge with their new evaluation skills acquired at IPDET. Participants described examples of implementing their new evaluations skills into their projects.

Question 6) What challenges did you face in using your newfound evaluation skills?

Forty-six percent (46%) of respondents stated that, overall, they faced no difficulties in using their newly-acquired evaluation skills. Certain respondents stated that colleagues and management were open to the new methodologies, in particular the participatory and

"No problem, the project was receptive to participatory and use oriented evaluation techniques."

¹¹ Attribution to IPDET is difficult as many participants had previous evaluation trainings.

use-oriented evaluation techniques learned at IPDET. Respondents also noted that the course was highly effective at addressing and preparing the participants for challenges they might encounter in evaluation. One surveyed participant also identified the importance of timing in building evaluation capacity and having formal evaluation training right before the start of the project. The surveyed participants who were project coordinators or had a more senior role in their organization found that they were more successful in implementing different types of methodologies within their organization.

"I am one of the few who are converted. There is no evaluation culture and people are not familiar with the methodologies within my organization. It was a lot of work to introduce the evaluation skills to other who lacked the skills about evaluation."

The respondents who stated that there were problems with using their newfound evaluation skills mainly referred to challenges relating to the lack of an evaluation culture within their organization.

Other difficulties included:

- A need for further experience because of gaps in their evaluation skills and knowledge;
- Not enough the time to implement monitoring and evaluation into projects;
- The difficulties applying the theories from IPDET into a project;
- Lack of budget for evaluation or support from management;
- Language and communication difficulties with other community members.

Question 7) Can you provide an example of feedback from others with whom you work, relating to your evaluation work since attending IPDET?

Several surveyed participants did not have a direct example of feedback regarding their new evaluation expertise. Others stated that they had received positive feedback from colleagues, managers and IDRC Program Officers. Specific examples included participants who were encouraged to share their knowledge on evaluation with colleagues and other organizations within their countries, including workshops and presentations to share their course materials, books and expertise. One person stated that his IPDET training helped to build an organization that recognizes a culture of evaluation. Individuals also responded that:

- They were promoted;
- They continue to work in the field of evaluation and that the project has benefited from having someone with evaluation training;
- They were recommended by others because of different types of evaluation work they have done following the IPDET training;
- Their evaluation outputs are being utilized.

c) Support and Networks

Question 8) To your knowledge, has your organization sent multiple participants to IPDET?

NO:
62%
(15)

Sixty-two percent (62%) of the participants surveyed indicated that, to their knowledge, no other participants received IPDET training. Twenty-nine percent (29%) felt that it would be worthwhile to have other colleagues receiving training. Funding for sending other colleagues to IPDET was a considerable barrier. One individual stated that it would not be useful to have others trained because of the small number of employees in the organization.

YES:
38%
(9)

Question 8a) If yes, how have you found it beneficial to have multiple co-workers qualified in IPDET?

The participants surveyed who came from organizations with other colleagues trained at IPDET were predominantly IDRC staff and frequently were unaware who else had received training. No participant surveyed was working directly with other IPDET graduates. In the case of IDRC staff, IPDET-trained individuals came from different offices and program areas. One IDRC staff member from a regional office felt it would be worthwhile to have others trained at IPDET. The partners who were trained also stated that they did not work directly with other IPDET trained colleagues. The reasons included that they were often in different geographical locations or ministries and did not have the opportunity to connect about evaluation. One person stated that monitoring and evaluation is a new focus and that there has not been a priority on building evaluation into the organization.

Question 9) Have you participated in the IPDET listserv? Can you provide some examples of the level and scope of your participation?

Eighty-seven percent (87%) of participants stated that they have participated in the IPDET listserv. When participants were asked to provide examples of the level of scope of use, 46% of individuals who were involved indicated that reading the listserv postings was the main level of their participation. Others stated that they do use the listserv as a resource for asking and answering questions, workshops and conference postings pertaining to evaluation.

"I continually read the postings on the listserv"

"It's in English so it is difficult to participate."

Thirteen percent (13%) of participants stated that they have not participated in the IPDET listserv. Reasons for their lack of involvement included:

- Language barrier (the listserv is in English);
- Lack of time;
- Some also felt that the evaluations listed on the listserv were different from those which they were involved;
- One person noted that the listserv was weak in content.

Question 10) Beyond the IPDET listserv, did you establish any other connections or networks with IPDET participants? a) Have you maintained these contacts?

Seventy-five percent (75%) of participants responded that they did establish other connections or networks with IPDET participants beyond the listserv. When asked if participants had maintained contact with connection or networks formed at IPDET, 62.5% of individuals stated they were still in contact.

"Yes, we formed a closed group of fifteen people from around the world."

Some people stated that the connections were on a friendly basis with some participants. Others are continually in contact with other IPDET scholars, in their own country or from around the world. They continue to be in contact at a social and/or professional level, and in

some cases have created local evaluation groups that meet on a regular basis. Twenty-five percent (25%) of participants stated that they did not establish connections beyond their time at IPDET.

Table 7: 10b) Did these connections or networks involve any of the following?	
Exchange of information:	YES: 17 (71%) NO: 7 (29%)
Brainstorming, exchange of ideas on specific projects (either yours or someone else's):	YES: 12 (50%) NO: 12 (50%)
Collaborative work on a specific project or activity	YES: 5 (21%) NO: 19 (79%)

Question 11) Did any of those networks/connections involve other IDRC staff and partners? If yes, can you provide some details about relationship?

Eighty-three percent (83%) of surveyed participants did not establish contact with other IDRC Staff or partners. Those 17% that are in contact with IDRC staff indicated that those relationships were established prior to IPDET. IDRC staff have evidently maintained contact with each other.

d) Enriching Evaluation Capacity

Question 12) What further evaluation training have you done since IPDET? How did this training complement your IPDET training?

Fifty-eight percent (58%) have received no further evaluation training since IPDET. It was noted that there is a lack of other evaluation training and that funding opportunities were limited. One individual stated that although he did not have further formal evaluation training, he has continued learning on evaluation by reading books. Further training received include: Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation System (RBMES) training; Outcome Mapping (OM) training and users conference, workshops at the American Evaluation Association (AEA) and the Canadian Evaluation Society (CES) 2005 Conference; the International Development Evaluation Society (IDEAS Conference). The attendance of participants in two of these training, the Outcome

Mapping and the AEA and CES Conference was funded by IDRC. Of those who received further evaluation training, the majority of respondents felt at this additional training complemented their IPDET training by building on their existing knowledge. One person stated that they had done IPDET such a long time ago, it was hard to attribute if further training had been complimentary.

Question 13) In your opinion, what else could the Evaluation Unit have done to enrich your experience before, during or after the IPDET program?

Participants were asked specifically what the IDRC Evaluation Unit (EU) could have done to enrich their experience before, during or after the IPDET program. Overwhelmingly, the feedback from the IPDET scholars was that nothing further needed to be done to enrich their experience. Some suggestions for the EU enriching the IPDET experience with the following:

Before or During IPDET

1. A briefing to provide more background information about what the IDRC Evaluation Unit does and its methodologies.
2. Guidance from the Evaluation Unit on which workshops are the most important.
3. The opportunity to meet more IDRC Staff in Ottawa and to come into the office for advice and guidance.
4. Encouragement for future IDRC-sponsored partners to participate in the workshop component of IPDET.

After IPDET

1. A debriefing to assess how the training had gone.
2. Creation of a list of trained evaluators to be called on for the Evaluation Unit's work.
3. Creation of a complete list IDRC-sponsored staff and partners who have participated in IPDET.
4. A Seeds Funds for small projects after the training to implement evaluation skills.
5. Continued training and evaluation conferences following IPDET.
6. Follow up with an evaluation to capture experiences and reflections of participants.
7. Create more opportunities to work with more experienced evaluators and receive mentoring from them.
8. Create more opportunities to get involved in the implementation of evaluation skills on IDRC projects.

Other

Outcome Mapping training should be given as an elective within the workshops.

Question 14) In your opinion, what else could IDRC have done to enrich your experience before, during or after the IPDET program?

IDRC staff nominated IDRC partners for the IPDET program. Overall, individuals were content with the support received by their sponsor. Many of the participants had the opportunity to meet with their IDRC sponsor and, in some cases, with other IDRC colleagues while in Ottawa, and they felt that it had been a positive experience. Only a few did not meet their sponsor, and those who did not have this opportunity felt it would have been worthwhile. Some also stated that their sponsor had followed up with their evaluation work.

e) Summary

Question 15) What level of evaluation experience would you suggest for future participants before they attend IPDET for the first time?

Thirty-eight percent (38%) of respondents expressed that the Core Course was designed as a broad overview for those individuals who had an evaluation experience which ranged from beginners to intermediate. Thirty-eight percent (38%) stated that the workshops were targeted to participants who had more experience and who were seeking specialized skills in evaluation methodologies. Other comments included that language can be a challenge in participating in IPDET, that researchers should have an education level at the Masters of Arts level, and that experienced researchers with little evaluation experience felt comfortable with the level of the training.

Question 16) Would you recommend IPDET to other researchers? (Yes or No) Why or why not?

"Yes, definitely as it is a great chance for professionals to build knowledge and networking in evaluation."

All but one of the interviewees stated that they would recommend IPDET to other researchers, although a number of respondents did identify weakness with the program. Ninety-six percent (96%) of participants stated that they would recommend IPDET to other researchers. Forty-two percent (42%) of participants stated that they have recommend IPDET to others working in the field of international development. When asked why they would recommend the program, the responses included: that IPDET offered a review of more established and some new methodologies, that the specialized workshops were practical, that the course offered an excellent opportunity for networking and learning from peers, and that IPDET was an excellent opportunity for skill and confidence building in the field of evaluations (in particular, having been trained by the World Bank was a seen as being impressive on their resume for future opportunities).

Only one person, or 4% of surveyed participants stated that they would not recommend IPDET to other researchers. Other stated that they would recommend IPDET to others but identified the following weaknesses of the program:

"The World Bank was pushing and reinforcing their ideas. There was no space for different types and alternative approaches in evaluation. Not a rights- based approach. It did not allow for a worldwide perspective."

- Criticism of the World Bank teaching style;
- Regimented format;
- Simplistic and not sufficiently participatory;
- Lack of alternative approaches in evaluation
- Funding support for IPDET was also seen as a concern for recommending IPDET to others. Without a scholarship, the majority of their colleague would not be able to attend.

B. IPDET Participants (IDRC partners), 2006

i. Overview:

The four IDRC-sponsored partners from IPDET 2006 surveyed were involved in designing and conducting evaluations, participatory methods of evaluation and development of logic models. The individuals surveyed stated that they intended to use these skills in projects and internal evaluations, as well as to build the capacity of others in their organizations. Their recommendations on how the EU could further support participants focused on strengthening opportunities for networking (with other researchers working in evaluation, EU staff and each other). All respondents stated they would recommend the IPDET to other researchers.

ii. By Question:

Question 6) Why did you choose to participate in the IPDET training?

"It was an opportunity to improve evaluation and learn the techniques evaluation and monitoring."

Responses included that they wanted to build knowledge and skills in evaluation, to have networking opportunities and to participate in IPDET, which in their opinion was regarded a high quality course.

Question 7a) What best described your current role or position? b) Are you directly involved in evaluation activities with your organization?

Surveyed participants included two professors, a general manager and a researcher officer. (50%) of the participants stated that they were directly involved in evaluation activities within their organization.

Question 8) Please tell us about any new skills and/or knowledge gained from your participation in the IPDET training?

"I have been able to learn about evaluation designs, logic models and applying participatory methods of evaluation."

The top three new skills or knowledge which respondents learned included:

- Designing and conducting evaluations.
- Participatory methods of evaluation
- Logic models

Question 9) How do you intend to apply your new knowledge/skills in evaluation?

Participants were asked how they intended to apply their new knowledge and skills in evaluation when they returned to their organization. All respondents stated that they intend to be implement skills and be involved in monitoring, evaluation design, and terms of reference for projects. Also, participants stated that the transfer of their new knowledge was a key intent. Other responses included conducting surveys, involvement in internal evaluation, and incorporating new knowledge and skills in the process of designing and conducting/implementing evaluations.

"[I intend] to transfer the knowledge and skills to members of the project team, team, staff, partners and students especially the working group on Monitoring and Evaluation as a way of building the capacity."

Question 10) In your opinion, what else could the Evaluation Unit have done to enrich your experience before or during the IPDET program?

"Interesting to have a short meeting (one day) before IPDET to know and share how IDRC expect that new knowledge and skills could be applied to the programs and projects currently supported."

Suggestions included:

- EU could organize a networking event to encourage cross-fertilization of ideas and knowledge sharing between the individuals from different projects.
- EU could continue with the linkage between partners to implement an evaluation system within their organization to better use the knowledge gained in the recent training.
- EU could design and implement a virtual working and study group to exchange lessons before, during and after IPDET.
- EU to maintain a link to IDRC-sponsored participants to continue learning and sharing knowledge.
- A longer session at IDRC to discuss among the scholarship recipients and IDRC colleagues.

Question 11) What level of evaluation experience would you suggest for future participants before they attend IPDET for the first time?

The respondents stated IPDET is suitable for those practitioners working in development with an intermediate level of experience. The workshops require some degree of interest and relevance on the part of the participant.

"[The] core course is quite academic in nature, and a veteran evaluator might find the course boring as there is not much opportunity to discuss and exchange of ideas during class."

Question 12) Would you recommend IPDET to other researchers?

"This program gives the opportunity to concentrate, in a relatively short time, a high level of knowledge and discussion about issues related with development evaluation programs and projects."

When asked if they would recommend IPDET to other researchers, 100% (n=4) of the 2006 participants would recommend the course. Respondents stated that IPDET gave them the

opportunity to learn and build self-confidence in a forum of global networks. It was also stated that the course was of high quality, with high-profile professors.

Question 13) Do you have any further comments or suggestions?

"I appreciate very much the support for participants involved in IDRC projects. It is expected that this is a way to enhance the quality and effectiveness of the projects we are conducting."

C. IDRC Staff Sponsors of IPDET, 2001-2006

i. Overview:

IDRC staff ¹² surveyed who sponsored a partner or fellow staff member to attend the IPDET training were uniformly positive about the program. Sponsors stated that they had nominated IDRC partners in order to strengthen the in-house evaluation capacity within projects, and most had observed the participants' application of this capacity within projects. Respondents also subscribed to the view that evaluation directly complements all research as a planning and learning tool. A number of respondents also noted networking to be an important and useful outcome of the training.

However, respondents also identified some challenges to participation in the program – namely, that the course was not located in the various regions, that there were language barriers, and that four weeks is a very long period of time for a course. The majority of recommendations for how the EU could better enrich the IPDET experience related to greater support to networking opportunities between participants after the course, and with EU staff before and after the program. Some also recommended that more training take place in the regions. Nevertheless, interviewees unanimously stated that they would nominate others to enrol in this high quality program in the future.

ii. By Question:

a) Background

Question 2) Why did you recommend _ for IPDET training?

IDRC sponsors were asked why they recommended individuals for the IPDET training. Overall, the rationale for recommending individuals was to build evaluation capacity within the projects. It was noted that the IDRC partners participating in IPDET had research teams that either lacked individual capacity in monitoring and evaluation, or that needed to build on previous trainings, like Outcome Mapping. For the most part, IDRC partners were sent to IPDET to gain needed monitoring and evaluation skills in order to enhance the project.

"She had been appointed to the newly created Monitoring and Evaluation Unit in the ministry. As the unit was just starting it was important for her to gain proper evaluation experience."

Question 2a) Why do you feel that the IPDET training is important?

"IPDET exposes individuals to different approaches, methodologies and groups at the same level in a multicultural setting. All elements of the training help with the criteria for learning."

The respondents stated that IPDET was a useful training for networking, developing new skills and building evaluation capacity for Southern partners. Having in house evaluation skills for a project was identified as being incredibly important.

¹² The list of IDRC staff who were interviewed is listed in Appendix A.

Question 3) Since IPDET, can you describe any particular instances where (the participant) has applied their monitoring and evaluation skills or knowledge?

"She used a number of different approaches and used direct reference to these skills from IPDET. She improved her own work and applied skills to the projects with which she worked."

Several staff described examples where partners implemented the monitoring and evaluation skills acquired at IPDET into their projects. Others stated that their partner's skills are a combination of the IPDET and other trainings, and that it was hard to attribute overall evaluation skills to IPDET. A number of the sponsors noted that the partner had been actively involved in implementing Outcome Mapping in their projects. However, Outcome Mapping was not a methodology taught in its entirety at IPDET. Some surveyed staff also stated that they had no specific examples of their partner's skills application. In some cases, the partner had left the project.

Question 4) Would you nominate other partners for IPDET training? Why or why not?

"Participants found the ability to be able to present their projects as key. To have critical feedback from peer group was very important."

A hundred percent (100%) of the IDRC sponsors unanimously stated that they would nominate other partners for future IPDET training. Respondents noted the high quality of the course, which offers a wide range of

methodologies and a practical environment for designing evaluations. Also, IPDET provided the opportunity for networking with participants from around the world and from different types of organizations. Challenges identified included language barriers, that the course is not located in the regions, that IPDET is very expensive, and the course length (four weeks).

Question 5) In your opinion, what else could the Evaluation Unit do to improve the IPDET experience?

Recommendations included:

- Follow up on the results and application of monitoring and evaluation after the course with participants.
- Opportunities for the partners to meet with staff from the Evaluation Unit.
- More articulated interface between attendance to the course and participants' role in their project.
- Possibility of establishing a network following the course to ensure there is a community of practice.

- Ensure that the participants have articulated their interest and intent in strengthening the project in the proposal prior to the course.
- Ensure that there are practical examples provided, and not just theory, to meet the needs of partners.

Question 5a) How can the Evaluation Unit improve the administration of the IPDET program?

The majority of respondents stated that there was nothing that could have been changed. In general, IDRC staff felt that the nomination process had been straightforward and that IPDET had efficiently organized everything for partners. It was suggested that the posting on the ECHOnet for the training be advertised sooner to avoid a “mad rush” for applications. One sponsor did encounter some administrative problems, but this referred to a specific case.

b) Building Evaluation Capacity

IDRC sponsors were also asked about suggestions for how the Evaluation Unit can continue to support evaluation capacity building with partners.

Question 6) In your opinion, how do you think evaluation capacity complements research?

All of the IDRC sponsors stated that evaluation capacity directly complements research.

Respondents identified that evaluation can be used for

planning and as a learning tool. Evaluation is also identified as a way of ensuring good practice at all stages of the project. Outcome Mapping was noted as a methodology that offers a number of different tools to enhance evaluation capacity and the quality of research.

“Enhancing evaluation capacity is also useful project planning and design and ongoing assessment of activities and to improve their success in projects.”

Question 7) Do you have any suggestions for other activities the Evaluation Unit could undertake to help build evaluation capacity with your partners?

“More training in the regions is important. Taking the show on the road rather than Ottawa.”

The IDRC Sponsors were asked for further suggestions for activities the Evaluation Unit could undertake to help build evaluation capacity. Recommendations included doing more training in the regions, creating more Centres of Excellence and nodes in the region for providing Outcome Mapping Training, Create a forum to share evaluation experiences, tailor the evaluation training to the specific needs of the organization.

Question 8) Do you have any further comments or suggestions?

“Glad to see that this survey is being done to check to see how relevant and timely the course has been to its participants.”

- Follow up on how participants are applying their evaluation skills.
- Further training in evaluation to enhance and keep skills relevant.
- Continued support for partners to attend IPDET
- Further Outcome Mapping trainings.
- Possible targeted training for a specific group of individuals could be useful.

IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

Overall, the study found the IPDET program to be useful in building evaluation capacity of IDRC-sponsored partners and staff. The program was found by many respondents to be a 'one-stop-shop,' providing a range of evaluation methodologies in one place. The majority of IDRC-sponsored participants stated that the IPDET program had either moderate or great influence over their work, organization and career – though respondents noted the strongest influence to have been on their individual work, and to a lesser degree on their careers and their organizations. IDRC-sponsored participants were very pleased with the profile of the instructors, who were practitioners with theoretical background. Most surveyed participants stated that they returned to their organizations and implemented their new knowledge and skills in evaluation into projects. Although the course is one focused on capacity building and evaluation, networking was an additional aspect of significance to all participants surveyed.

Most respondents stated that they did not encounter many difficulties in applying their newfound skills, although they noted that the concepts themselves were indeed challenging. An important finding that emerged from the study is that participants did not necessarily require additional formal evaluation training in order to apply their new skills effectively. About half of participants interviewed stated that they went for further evaluation training after the IPDET program; however, those that did not attend such trainings applied their skills to the same extent in their workplaces as those who went on to further training. Some participants also noted that the training itself was helpful in preparing them to foresee and/or address some of the challenges they might encounter when applying these skills. It should be noted, however, that since some attendees had received other evaluation training, it was difficult to attribute these results solely to the IPDET course.

All surveyed groups found networking to be a very important outcome of the training. Participants used the listserv and informal communication methods to maintain strong links and support networks with each other after the program. Networking was found to contribute to the sustainability of awardees using their skills, building working relationships and future collaborations. For instance, participants from various regions, including Southern Africa and Southeast Asia, said that they kept in regular contact with fellow awardees in their region (through monthly meetings), or cross-regionally (through e-mail). While networking was found to be a significant outcome of the training by the majority of interviewees, it was not identified as an area that IDRC had actively supported following trainings.

While overall, participants had positive comments on IPDET, there were also a number of mixed views on its format and content. Some felt that four weeks was long for training; however, others thought this timeframe allowed them to get a broad overview as well as some specific skills in evaluation. Surveyed participants found the core course provided the broader overview, while the workshops offered more specialized training. Some of the respondents found the course to cover too many methodologies without providing sufficient details about each; others instead felt this provided them with a strong basis in evaluation methodologies. Several participants critiqued the program for having too much of a "World Bank focus," and was not offering other approaches. Another critique was that the training did not allow for enough specificity of focus on individual projects, as they felt other trainings, such as Outcome Mapping (OM) trainings, provide.

A number of interviewees recommended more IDRC follow-up evaluation support to enrich their training and learning experience. It is interesting to note that many who identified challenges or problems in applying their evaluation skills often identified this lack of support or of an evaluation culture within their own institution. IDRC-sponsored project partners participating in IPDET were also not always familiar with IDRC staff, beyond their individual sponsors, prior to 2006.¹³ Follow-up networking support would be a key way that the EU could enrich the training experience. Sharing participants' lists and encouraging opportunities for all IDRC sponsors and IDRC-sponsored partners to meet (as happened in 2006), would be two ways IDRC could facilitate networking with minimal input. IDRC could also consider asking that, as part of the scholarship, partners' institutions allocate time for the participant once returned from the training to discuss the training with fellow colleagues and build others' evaluation capacity.

However, one of the challenges to IDRC providing more in-depth follow up and support to awardees is the additional staff time it would demand of IDRC personnel. An additional challenge in this area is in the identification of who within IDRC should or could provide such follow-up (i.e. EU staff or IDRC sponsors). Sponsors seem to be in an ideal role to conduct such follow-up support because they have a direct link with awardees and are working interactively with them. However, sponsors noted not having the time, and sometimes not having the evaluation capacity themselves, to do this. Meanwhile, such follow-up also falls outside the scope or mandate of the EU, and would also place strains on their staff capacity. In order to address the lack of time that Program Officers have to conduct such follow-up, one of suggestions made by an IDRC staff interviewee was that perhaps an outside consultant could be hired to conduct such follow-up. However, not having had an ongoing relationship with the partner or the project on which they work would be an obstacle to outside consultants.

A number of respondents stated that the location of IPDET was an extra challenge for participants in the regions— particularly in terms of language barriers. However, other participants felt that the opportunity to meet colleagues representing different types of organizations from around the world was one of the most valuable aspects of networking afforded by the program. One of the issues that might arise with such language barriers is that the better candidates for the training may not be able to attend if their English is not strong enough.

One way to counteract the location and language barriers is to have the participating partner's institution make a commitment to allow the IPDET participant to engage in capacity building with other in their organization, including those who could not attend for language reasons. Another way to address this challenge could be to establish evaluation nodes within IDRC's institutional partners in each region.

Is IPDET the best form of delivery for building the evaluation capacity of IDRC partners? While some sponsors questioned the cost-effectiveness of the program, overall, interviewees felt this was an effective method for building their evaluation capacity. Given the lack of comprehensive evaluation trainings available to IDRC partners around the globe, the IPDET program is identified as a good way for the EU to continue to

¹³ In 2006, IDRC's approach to bring all awardees together during the training, along with all of the IDRC sponsors and some EU staff. This seemed to strengthen networking between participants and IDRC personnel, although it is too soon to confirm this.

support its partners and staff. While the core program is more useful to individuals with little or no experience in evaluation, the workshops may be of greater use to people with some evaluation background. Respondents also felt a greater focus on OM within the IPDET curriculum would be very valuable. The EU could also continue to provide a briefing or networking meeting, as was done in 2006, to provide IDRC-sponsored participants with a solid understanding of the EU, its resources and its mandate.

V. APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Contributors

The following staff were interviewed and generously contributed their time to provide feedback and share ideas and information for this study.

IDRC Staff (IDPET Participants sponsored by):

Roberto Bazzanni Regional Program Officer, Governance Equity and Health, IDRC-LACRO, Montevideo.

Brian Bonnell Senior Program Officer, Asia, International Model Forest Network, IDRC, Ottawa.

Federico Burone Regional Director, IDRC-LACRO, Montevideo.

Sarah Earl Senior Program Officer, Evaluation Unit, IDRC, Ottawa

Florence Etta former Project Coordinator, Connectivity Africa, IDRC-ESARO, Nairobi.

Merle Faminow Team Leader, Montevideo.

Gregory Goodwin Small and Medium Enterprise Specialist, IDRC-MERO, Cairo.

Mark Redwood Program Officer, Urban Poverty and Environment

APPENDIX B: IDRC-Sponsored IPDET Participants

Shirin Abdul Razeq	Kaia Ambrose
Anita Anthonysamy	Isabelita Austria
Thierry Barreto Fernandes	Moataz-Behhah El-Guindy
Kishore Bhirdikar	Alvaro Cardona
Arturo Campana	Jean D'Aragon*
Rasha El-Habashy	George Danso
Santiago Elmudesi	Amy Etherington*
Katerina Fialova	Paul Giacomini
Katherine Hay *	Rosalea Hamilton
Nasreen Jessani*	Elwathig Mohamed Kameir
Paul Kuria	Rebecca Lee*
Shuaib Lwasa	Martha Melesse*
Chris Morris	Shingirayi Mushamba
Alberto Narvaez	Seydou Niang
Thomas Nifinluri	John Novarly
Vincent Okongo	Emanuel Orozco
Narayana Peesapaty	Clara Piriz
Sophia Saad	Nael Salman
David Schwartz*	Rekha Shori
Chaitali Sinha*	Ramata Thioune*
Tracy Tuplin	Alice Wanjira

*Indicate that participants are IDRC Staff.

Names in bold indicate those who were interviewed

APPENDIX C: Letter sent to IDRC-Sponsored IPDET Participants, 2001-2005

Dear (Participants Name)

The Evaluation Unit of the International Development Research Centre (IDRC), is conducting a tracer study of IDRC-sponsored participants in the International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET). The aim of the study is to determine how training from IPDET has influenced your work, your organization and your overall career. The purpose is to help improve the Centre's support to evaluation capacity building in the future. We value your input and perspective as an IPDET scholar. We want to stress, however, this is in no way an evaluation of you or your work. Rather, it is designed to enhance the support we provide to individuals in building their evaluation capacity. All responses will be reported in aggregate form and will not be attributed to you individually. You will be provided with a copy of the final report for your information and comment.

To assist us with this study, we hope you are willing to participate in a brief 30 minute, telephone interview on your IPDET experience. The interview questions will include sections on: background, work history, applying your skills, support and networks, enriching evaluation capacity and summary. Rebecca Lee, a researcher with the Evaluation Unit will contact with you in the near future to identify a time for the interview or you can contact her at rlee@idrc.ca.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Fred Carden
Director
Evaluation Unit
International Development Research Centre
www.idrc.ca/evaluation

APPENDIX D: Letter Sent to IDRC Sponsors, 2001-2006

Dear (IDRC Program Officer)

The Evaluation Unit is conducting a tracer study of IDRC sponsored participants in the International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET). You sponsored (X) for the program and we would like your perspective on the outcome of their training. The objective of this survey is to determine how to more effectively support individuals in developing and sustaining evaluation skills that enhances their work, careers and their organizations. Your input and perspectives will help improve the Evaluation Unit's support of evaluation capacity building in the future. We hope you will participate in a short 15-minute interview, pertaining to your IPDET nominated participant.

A more extensive survey will be conducted with each of the IPDET scholars. You will be provided with a copy of the final report for your information and comment. Rebecca Lee, a researcher with the Evaluation Unit will contact with you in the near future to identify a time for the interview or you can contact her at rlee@idrc.ca.

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me. We thank you in advance for helping with this important study.

Sincerely,

APPENDIX E: Survey for IDRC-Sponsored IPDET Participants, 2001-2005

IPDET Evaluation

As you may recall from the letter you were sent: The Evaluation Unit is conducting a tracer study of IDRC sponsored participants of the International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET). The aim of the study is to determine how training from IPDET has influenced your work, your organization and your overall career. The purpose is to help improve the Centre's support to evaluation capacity building in the future. We value your input and perspective as an IPDET scholar. We want to stress, however, this is in no way an evaluation of you or your work.

The questionnaire should take approximate 30 minutes. As I previously mentioned it will be recorded. Do you have any questions before we begin?

Background

1) You participated in IPDET in(_) and you attended the following core courses or workshops (_) Please confirm?

2) How have the skills and knowledge you acquired at IPDET influenced:

a) Your work?

No influence ☐ *Little influence* ☐ *Moderate influence* ☐ *Great influence* ☐

b) Your organization?

No influence ☐ *Little influence* ☐ *Moderate influence* ☐ *Great influence* ☐

c) Your career?

No influence ☐ *Little influence* ☐ *Moderate influence* ☐ *Great influence* ☐

3) Why did you participate in the IPDET training?

Work History

4) When you first attended IPDET, were you directly involved in evaluation activities with your organization? (Yes or No)

a) What best described your role or position at that time?

b) Have you changed jobs or organizations since attending IPDET?
(Yes or No)

c) If you changed jobs or organizations since attending IPDET, are you now more or less involved in evaluation activities?

d) How would you describe your change in role and to what extent do you think

the change was influenced by your attendance at IPDET?

Applying your Skills

5) Do you have an example of a contribution you have made to an evaluation project or activity since your IPDET training?

6) What challenges did you face in using your newfound evaluation skills?

7) Can you provide an example of feedback from others with whom you work, relating to your evaluation work since attending IPDET?

Support and Networks

8) To your knowledge, has your organization sent multiple participants to IPDET? (Yes or No)

a) If yes, how have you found it beneficial to have multiple co-workers qualified in IPDET evaluation training?

9) Have you participated in the IPDET listserv? (Yes or No)

a) Can you provide some examples of the level and scope of your participation?

10) Beyond the IPDET List Serve, did you establish any other connections or networks with IPDET participants?

a) Have you maintained these contacts?

b) Did these connections or networks involve any of the following?

- Exchange of information ☐
- Brainstorming, exchange of ideas on specific projects (either your or someone else's) ☐

Collaborative work on a specific project or activity. ☐

11) Did any of those networks/connections involve other IDRC staff and partners?

a) If yes, can you provide some details about relationship?

Enriching Evaluation Capacity

12) What further evaluation training have you done since IPDET?

a) How did this training complement your IPDET training?

13) In your opinion, what else could the Evaluation Unit have done to enrich your experience before, during or after the IPDET program?

14) In your opinion, what else could your IDRC sponsor, have done to enrich your

experience before, during or after the IPDET program?

Summary

15) What level of evaluation experience would you suggest for future participants before they attend IPDET for the first time?

16) Would you recommend IPDET to other researchers? (Yes or No)
Why or why not?

17) Do you have any further comments or suggestions?

Thank you for taking the time to participate today. I will provide you with the final report on its completion.

APPENDIX F: Survey Response for IDRC-Sponsored IPDET Participants, 2001-2005

Background

3) Why did you participate in the IPDET training?

I was sent by IDRC as part of the project that needed the evaluation skill. (5)
I want to improve understanding and gain new skills (up grade skills) and techniques of evaluation methodology tools.(18)
The scholarships were available.
I went to IPDET for training in OM. (2)
I had no previous evaluation experience. (4)
I was interested in the curriculum and I wanted to improve my qualitative skills.
The project involved the institutionalization of M&E and the training of field staff in M&E.
The project had no evaluation capacity and at the mid term review they were critiqued for needing a more specific M&E component.
For strategic planning for the organization to move into a new arena and be able to offer evaluation expertise
To have an over view of understanding of what other institution are involved with.
I needed a mechanism for a specific framework for the new strategy for the e-government.
I valued the training personally and helpful at the local level of my organization.

Work History

4) When you first attended IPDET, were you directly involved in evaluation activities with your organization? (Yes or No)

YES: 14 (58%)

- *Yes, I was involved with the development of the Gender Evaluation Methodologies.*
- *I was directly involved in using OM. (5)*

NO: 10 (42%)

- *Not directly as most of the evaluations were external evaluations.*
- *No not directly but indirectly. (8)*
- *No there was no evaluation.*
- *Very new to the field of evaluation.*
- *No, I did attend OM training.*
- *No, I come from a research organization not an evaluation organization.*

a) What best described your role or position at that time?

IDRC Staff

- *I was initially the Research Officer and coordinated the evaluations for my team.*
- *I was working at IDRC in the regional office SARO.*
- *I was a Professional Development Awardee with the IDRC Evaluation Unit.(2)*
- *I was an intern in IDRC's Partnership and Business Development.*

Coordinator

- *Program Coordinator that followed up on the implementation of projects*
- *Project coordinator, not directly doing evaluations, involved in working with OM.*
- *Regional Coordinator working in Gender Evaluation Methodology in Eastern Europe.*
- *I was the coordinator of Monitoring and Evaluation for the Swamsidha project.*
- *Project coordinator for the OM project experiment and Responsible for Resources and Development Division.*

Researcher

- *I was lead of an interdisciplinary research team, I represented the social science side of the team.*
- *Research policy development with the government.*
- *A Research Associate.*
- *Research Consultant with an IDRC project.*
- *Researcher. I was not doing evaluations directly but I used evaluation skills in projects. I have also been involved in the review process.*

Project Manager

- *Project Officer.*
- *Project Management, administration and some evaluation.*

Other

- *A Commissioner for the Commission of Communication in Kenya and Managed an ICT project.*
- *Partnerships facilitator. Focused on external relationships-knowledge of evaluation was helpful.*
- *Knowledge analyst. Supervise evaluation within the team and with partners.*
- *Program development.*
- *Development program to protect workers and the evaluations of the programs. Including the monitoring of projects. I do the observation missions and evaluated the negative impacts in Ecuador and Colombia.*
- *I was head of evaluation and analysis in the forestry and planning project. I was responsible for training of staff and community members.*

**b) Have you changed jobs or organizations since attending IPDET?
(Yes or No)**

YES: 16 (67%) No: 8 (33%)

Same position

- *I am with the same organization and the same job. Now I have more responsibility and I am more involved in evaluation.*
- *I am much more involved and incorporating M&E into current work and projects.*
- *Benefits for my organization since I have gone to IPDET.*
- *I realize since IPDET, seen that the market for evaluation is an increasing interest. Now the organization is in a better position to be able to market themselves in offering evaluation services.*

Promoted within my current organization.

- *I have been promoted within my current organization.(7)*
- *I shifted into working directly with the project team.*
- *Now the country director for the organization in Bangladesh*
- *Yes, I am working in the same organization, but I have changed roles. (2)*

Changed jobs

- *I am working for a new organization.(2)*
- *Doing increasing evaluation consulting work (3)*
- *Research Consultant with another project from IDRC.*

Changed Careers

- *I have gone back to school*
- *I changed jobs and I am now a librarian.*
- *I am now working for myself as a life coach.*
- *I have not changed jobs, but I now also teach at a University.*

c) If you changed jobs or organizations since attending IPDET, are you now more or less involved in evaluation activities?

More: 16 (67%)

- *I am now more involved in evaluation activities and have a wider scope for development evaluation concerns. From project level monitoring and evaluation, my role has been elevated to sector level concerns on strategic planning, monitoring and evaluation in forestry.*
- *No change in job but I am more involved in evaluation, I am much more involved in evaluation activities.*
- *More but applied to my life, but not to development evaluation. The use is more around my new work in coaching.*
- *I am much more involved in evaluation activities (6)*
- *No change in job but I am more involved in evaluation.(3)*
- *Less involved with the coordination of the evaluations but more involved in overseeing how evaluations are done. More involved in projects evaluations.*
- *I am more involved in evaluation and have integrated evaluation into a Masters program I am teaching.*
- *I am more involved in evaluation with my work in the evaluation unit.*

- *I am now more involved in evaluation activities and have a wider scope for development evaluation concerns. From project level monitoring and evaluation, my role has been elevated to sector level concerns on strategic planning, monitoring and evaluation in forestry.*
- *More involved in research and some evaluation. I am not involved directly in evaluation of projects. More involved in broad based evaluations and implementation of evaluation.*
- *I have used my evaluation knowledge in the management of the project.*
- *I did not change positions but I am much more involved in specific evaluations. Analysis and Evaluation of the ICT4D policy process and implementation of ICT policy.*

Same: 6 (25%)

- *I am continually involved with evaluation. I now have additional skills and have made the effort to apply skills and networks I created, including evaluation design.*
- *Marginally, I was involved in the CAF and applying evaluation to the teams works plan. I used training skills in design of project development.*
- *I continue to work with various forms of monitoring and evaluation in my work.*
- *I am continually involved with evaluation. I now have additional skills and have made the effort to apply skills and networks I created, including evaluation design.*
- *I worked in the Evaluation Unit so its different. I have more responsibilities and more involvement in evaluation activities.*
- *I continue to be a researcher working on a new project.*
- *In my current job I am equally involved in evaluation activities. I was actively involved in evaluation networks, yet time has been a factor in staying involved.*

Less: 2 (8%)

- *I am less involved in evaluation activities as I have had a career change.*
- *I have gone back to school.*

d) How would you describe your change in role and to what extent do you think the change was influenced by your attendance at IPDET?

Influence on career

Direct Influence (54% n=13)

- *I was influenced by IPDET, I am now aware of different aspects of evaluation.*
- *Yes, my attendance at IPDET has given me the skills and knowledge to apply within my projects.(4)*
- *I am more confident in evaluation terminology and methodology since attending IPDET.*
- *IPDET increased my knowledge and ability to do analysis and evaluate which I am now more involved.*
- *Using the Development Evaluation Approach.*
- *Yes, evaluation in Mexico was only focused on quantitative and I wanted to learn*

about qualitative methods. IPDET taught me how to deal with both qualitative and quantitative evaluations.

- *I think throughout my stay during the program, I had feeling to study in Canada because I love the people and the environment. I have been to several countries but I decided to study here which was mainly due to IPDET.*
- *I believe my attendance at IPDET has influenced the head of Office's decision to assign me in my present post.*
- *I chartered new role in our organization for implementing Evaluation in career path.*
- *My new role is more challenging because its concerns are more holistic, integrative and strategic approach towards evaluation.*

Some influence (29% n=7)

- *IPDET had an input in my career but not directly involved in my change in job.*
- *IPDET was an eye opener*
- *I am more actively involved with evaluation. I would say IPDET had a small degree of attribution to my job change. But it was more training which is always useful.*
- *No real direct influence in the change. But changed my perspective positively in applying skills to my work.*
- *It is hard to contribute my change in job to IPDET. I now work more on evaluation since IPDET. It is one factor. I am working much more with OM.*
- *It was not directly an influence. Applying evaluation results in advocacy and research.*
- *Not a direct influenced by IPDET. It shifted my views from macro level to a more of a practical program level view. I have made evaluation more relevant*
- *The skills which I am applying are a combination of knowledge from IPDET, OM training and from my own experience.*
- *I am currently providing support an organization in Benin to build evaluation system with Outcome Mapping.*

No influence 17% (n=4)

- *It was not related at all to my attendance at IPDET.(2)*
- *No it did not have a direct influence, but taught how to focus on main issues on evaluation.(2)*

Applying your Skills

5) Do you have an example of a contribution you have made to an evaluation project or activity since your IPDET training?

Building on previous experience on Outcome Mapping.

- *IPDET help build on my experience of Outcome Mapping. I have also help to implement Outcome Mapping into my IDRC projects.(4)*
- *Using Outcome Mapping and combining with other quantitative approach, for more balances and results based.*
- *After coming back from IPDET I arranged a workshop on what I learned and on OM and taught outcome mapping to other institutions.(3)*

Implementing new skills evaluation skills into their project.

- *I am not doing pure evaluations, but I am brushing on different skills. I am applying a number of different methodologies to different projects.*
- *I assisted in the design of evaluation questions for my projects.*
- *My skills have been useful in developing projects and specifically of monitoring and evaluation.*
- *I also look at gender equality in programming in the region.*
- *I was involved in the Network Study with the Evaluation Unit-network coordinators, survey tool and reviewed drafts.*
- *I am a member of the DENR Technical Evaluation Committee that evaluated the various proposals for the World Bank-assisted Environment and Natural Resource Program in the Philippines.*

6) What challenges did you face in using your newfound evaluation skills?

No problems

- *No specific problems. I did not have enough opportunities to apply my skills.*
- *No problems- I had my training at the right time, just at the start of the Commission. Starting new project, formal training before the project started.*
- *No particular challenges. Practices participatory evaluations, takes practices and skills to implement.*
- *People were open to the new methodologies, which I learned.(3)*
- *The project was receptive to participatory and use oriented evaluation techniques. (3)*
- *Even the project management was involved in evaluation practices.*
- *I am the project coordinator so I have greater control and I did not face barriers.*
- *No I did not have any challenges. The course already addressed all the challenges.*

Problems

- *I am one of the few who are converted. There is no evaluation culture and people are not familiar with the methodologies. It was a lot of work to introduce the evaluation skills to other who lacked the skills about evaluation.(4)*
- *The management at the beginning of the process is trying to implement. I learned how to deal and how to lobby to implement new approaches*
- *Not a component within our projects. National level has not established constructs for evaluation.*
- *Language difficulties and the challenge of how to communicate to community members.*
- *Only problem is the methodologies, you often need a theory and framework and often need to adapt to my own project and viewpoint, which is very different from the World Bank.*
- *I still find evaluation a challenging area. Particularly in terms of implementing skills.*
- *In relation to teaching evaluation, the challenges were relating macro learning to micro level practices.*
- *I had to learn to listen to clients and researchers as part of the decision process.*
- *I felt that I needed further experience and that there were gaps in my expertise.*
- *People have limited visions about evaluation as learning.(2)*
- *Allowing for the time and work for incorporating some methodologies.*

- *Time was the greatest factor that the organization does not set aside the time or structure for evaluations. (2)*
- *That evaluations are prepackaged from donors and do not allow your the local organization opportunities to try out new evaluation skills. (2)*
- *There is no budget for evaluations in our programs.*

7) Can you provide an example of feedback from others with whom you work, relating to your evaluation work since attending IPDET?

Received positive feedback

- *I did get positive feedback from IDRC and other colleagues about my evaluation skills. (9)*
- *I was promoted and have been given positive feedback from people who I work with. (2)*
- *The project has benefited from having someone with evaluation training.*
- *Broadly positive, because of the support I got after my return was receptive.*
- *People were encouraged by my new skill set.*
- *I am working on an going basis in the field of evaluation.*
- *Since IPDET, I have prepared two projects which both have gotten funded*

Share Learning

- *After coming back from IPDET I arranged a workshop to present learning. (2)*
- *I have been asked to give presentations within the organization and shared knowledge and books with others.(2)*
- *Colleagues have asked me to assist them, as they know of my expertise after I attended IPDET.*
- *I am often recommended by others because of all the different types of evaluation work I have done.*
- *My past organization recognized a culture of evaluation, which can be attributed to the experience I brought back.*
- *My participation in evaluation-related activities mentioned earlier are well appreciated and the outputs are being used.*

No feedback

- *I have not received feed back in a formal evaluation setting.(3)*
- *I did not do any specific evaluation work after returning from IPDET*
- *Nothing directly in terms of feedback and at the same time nothing negative.*

Other

- *Having IPDET training on my CV has really stood out and people have commented on my attendance at the training.*

Support and Networks

8) To your knowledge, has your organization sent multiple participants to IPDET? (Yes or No)

NO: 62% (15)

- *It would be useful to have someone to work with and uses as a sounding board. IPDET has provided a network and a community to share information it's different when you have someone directly in your organization to help you and understand the challenges.*
- *We did not have others trained from IPDET(7)- I would benefit as I am currently working with people from outside the organization to brainstorm ideas.*
- *We did not have others trained from IPDET. No I do not feel that having other colleagues trained would be of benefit. The course is focused on the individual, and their own ability to meet people from around the world and develop own career.*
- *We did not have others trained from IPDET- I would have found it beneficial. You often need more then one. Now that I have left there us no one left behind.*

a) If yes, how have you found it beneficial to have multiple co-workers qualified in IPDET evaluation training?

YES: 38%(9)

- *There were two others involved in the project that were at IPDET. They only came for the electives and not the core.*
- *Yes, in the past we worked with another ministry. One person from the other ministry was sent to IPDET. We no longer work directly with the ministry and they did not work directly with me.*
- *Yes, from IDRC, No not from WARO regional office.*
- *Monitoring and Evaluation is a new focus and we have not focused on building evaluation into the organization.*
- *I was the only person from India from my organization. There were two from my organization, however they are from other countries.*

9) Have you participated in the IPDET listserv? (Yes or No)

87% (n=21)

a) Can you provide some examples of the level and scope of your participation?

Read the listserv

- *I just read the postings on the listserv.(11)*

Occasionally use the listserv

- *I have provided information if people are interested in specific questions.*
- *I put an add on for TORs for evaluators and as a result one of Michael Patton's student responded.*
- *I forward ICT Gender Evaluation information to people for their work.*
- *I do pass on information to others.*
- *I often respond to questions with regard to OM.*
- *Answering questions**
- *I have used the listserv a lot. Continually contributing.*
- *I have used the listserv for asking questions on comparative types of methodologies.*
- *Not all the time but I read email and resources and use the listserv for asking advice.*
- *From the listserv, I had a student of Michael Quinn Patton come to help with evaluations.*

- *Used for the notification of workshops and conferences.*

Not actively involved

- *Not actively involved.(6)*
- *It's in English so its difficult to participate.*
- *Most people on the listserv are doing different types of evaluations from which I am involved.(2)*
- *I feel that the participatory aspect of the listserv is very weak.*

10) Beyond the IPDET listserv, did you establish any other connections or networks with IPDET participants?

YES: 75% (n=18)

- *Yes, just in a friendly way.(4)*
- *Yes, with some of the participants.(5)*
- *Yes, we formed a closed group of 15 people from around the world. (2)*
- *Yes, I did and as a result applied to do some work in the Czech Republic.*
- *I am part of the Senegalese evaluation network.*
- *I am also connected with the World Bank and IPDET and have been sent evaluation reports by these contacts.*
- *We have also formed a South African group, and we meet monthly on a social level.*
- *Yes- with two of the other IDRC scholars who from Model Forest project in Indonesia which is part of the existing Regional Model Forest Network where in out Philippine Model Forest is also a part.(2)*

NO: 25% (n=6)

- *Only during the two weeks.*
- *No I did not make any connections networks at IPDET.*

a) Have you maintained these contacts?

YES: 62.5% (n=15) and NO: 37.5% (n=9)

b) Did these connections or networks involve any of the following?

- **Exchange of information** ☐ **YES: (71%) n=17 NO: (29%) n=7**
- **Brainstorming, exchange of ideas on specific projects (either your or someone else's)** ☐ **YES: 50% (n=12) NO: 50%(n=12)**

Collaborative work on a specific project or activity. ☐

NO:79% (n=19) YES: 21% (n=5)

11) Did any of those networks/connections involve other IDRC staff and partners?

NO: 83% (n=20) YES: 17% (n= 4)

a) If yes, can you provide some details about relationship?

Enriching Evaluation Capacity

12) What further evaluation training have you done since IPDET? How did this training complement your IPDET training?

NONE: 14 (58%)

- *No- I just followed up on my own evaluation readings. I have extended my experience into results based management and will be presenting a paper on results based approach in the public sector management.*
- *No- But working in academia I am always working and improving on evaluation skills*

YES: 10 (42%)

Outcome Mapping

- *Yes, I did Outcome Mapping training and it built on my past knowledge by IPDET. (2)*
- *I did OM training. It was nice just to have one methodology versus IPDET, which went over so many. I felt the methodology was not in details enough, although I only did the core course.*
- *I went to Senegal and Peru to exchange experiences on Outcome Mapping.*

AEA/CES & Conferences

- *I went to the AEA/CES Conference and took workshops which complimented my existing skills. (3)*
- *Yes, I went to a conference in India with IDEAS. Yes, it complimented my training.*

Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation Systems

- *Yes, Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation System, as applied for projects funded by the United Nations Development Program. It compliments the Ten steps to a Results Based Monitoring and Evaluation Systems, which I learned at IPDET.*

Other

- *Yes, directly, but life coach training. Yes this training has built on my evaluation skills. I identified strengths during IPDET and then followed this career direction.*

13) In your opinion, what else could the Evaluation Unit have done to enrich your experience before, during or after the IPDET program?

- *Nothing(6)*

Recommendations

Before or during IPDET

- *More background about what the IDRC Evaluation Unit does and their methodologies.*
- *Prior to IPDET having guidance from the EU on which workshops are the most important would be helpful.(3)*
- *I would have liked to meet more IDRC Staff in Ottawa and to come into the office for advice and guidance.*
- *I recommend that future partners take the workshops section of IPDET.*

After IPDET

- *Could create a list of trained evaluators to be called on for Evaluation Unit's work (4)*
- *To be able to form a mailing list or contact network with IDRC participants. It would be useful to share a list of who from IDRC and partners have participated in the training.(2)*
- *After, having Seed Funds for small projects after the training to implement evaluation skills.*
- *There is an importance in the continuation of trainings, evaluation conferences, returning to IPDET to up date skills. (6)*
- *It is important to follow up with this Evaluation and to capture experiences and reflections of participants. (2)*
- *Important to have a briefing from the Evaluation unit and a debriefing to establish how the training had gone.*
- *Maybe the scholars can be gathered once more as resource person or facilitators. We might discover the application of IPDET learning in varied situations.*
- *I would like to work with more experienced individuals and to learn from them.*
- *There are many IDRC projects going on. It would be useful to be able to get involved and see real life implementation of skills and real case studies.*
- *The importance of IDRC's role in supporting and building of evaluation capacity through IPDET. Request to broaden support to civil society and government in Kenya.*
- *I would like to recommend that IDRC through IMFNS discuss the possibility of conducting Regional Workshops on Development Evaluation, this would provide a venue for reporting progress.*

Other (recommendations for IPDET)

- *Outcome Mapping should be given as an elective within the workshops.*
- *To recommend that IDRC scholars be allowed to work as one small group in the IPDET workshop to ensure use of IDRC supported project information.*
- *Many people were from government and World Bank and not civil society.*

14) In your opinion, what else could your IDRC sponsor, have done to enrich your experience before, during or after the IPDET program?

- *Nothing further.*
- *I met with my sponsor and other colleagues at IDRC which was extremely useful*

- (4).
 - *There was nothing further my sponsor could have done he was very supportive*
- (8)
 - *My sponsor was very involved and followed up on my evaluation work.*
 - *would like to thank IDRC for the scholarship and for the excellent IPDET experience.*
- *I would have liked to have met my sponsor while I was in Ottawa.*

Summary

15) What level of evaluation experience would you suggest for future participants before they attend IPDET for the first time?

Core Course

- *First 2 weeks for beginners to intermediate. (6)*
- *Moderate level for the core 2-week training.*
- *Go to the first part if you don't have evaluation training.*
- *I found the first two weeks were rushed with a lot of information*
- *The first two weeks prepared those who are green, to be prepared for the workshops.*

Workshops

- *For the workshop it is for people who are experienced and aware of evaluation and for the exchange of information. (3)*
- *The second week was very focused and I found it very useful.*
- *I participated in the 4 weeks and I felt that the two weeks workshops were useful in actively applying new knowledge.*
- *Second 2 weeks for specialized. (2)*
- *The workshops were for medium level participants*
- *I did not attend the second two weeks but from what I heard, the second two weeks of workshops could be more useful for people.*

Level

- *Many different levels and it works well and was richer. Great opportunities for skilled and unskilled. (8)*
- *Good to have some experience in evaluation for both the core and the workshops. (5)*
- *Intermediate to advance skills before attending IPDET(2)*
- *Some knowledge, good critical eye of what they are being trained in and how to apply it to your work.*
- *Good to understand evaluation in the development process and the importance of institutionalizing evaluations.*
- *Basic knowledge of what evaluation means before you go and what it means to your organization.*
- *Beginners should have orientation before they go on the different approaches.*
- *It is a bit overwhelming for people who have no experience.*

Other

- *Language difficulties can also be a challenge.*

- *IPDET is a good level and stretches people from their comfort level.*
- *Do the course if you know you are going to apply it, you do need a desire and passion to learn.*
- *Preferably with an MA(2) but no previous evaluation experience is necessary to get to IPDET.*
- *If you have research experience you are fine with no evaluation experience.(2)*
- *A lot was not applicable you need to look at what is being offered to see if it matches with what the partners are looking for.*

Importance of building evaluation capacity

- *Great need for IDRC to build evaluation capacity and to continue to support individuals, NGO's.*
- *The EU really supports a lot of southern researchers from around the world in building evaluation skills.*
- *I suggest that IDRC keeps supporting IPDET and continues to stimulate partners and IDRC staff in the area of evaluation.*
- *It's a growing field and the importance there is a great importance with the growing network.*

16) Would you recommend IPDET to other researchers? (Yes or No) Why or why not?

Yes, I have recommended to other working in international development

- *Yes, and I have recommended other researchers.(6)*
- *Recommended for researchers or project managers working in Development.*
- *Yes, the importance of having evaluation skills is very much required while working in international development.(2)*
- *Yes, definitely as it is a great chance for professionals to build knowledge and networking in evaluation.*

Offered a number of methodologies in one place.

- *It was a good experience, good to have all the methods given in one place.*
- *Yes and it's the only course that is offered which has a broad view of evaluation.*

Specifically the Workshops

- *Yes, especially the workshops.*
- *I would recommend doing the entire training, particular the second week.*
- *Its also important to be aware of the specialized types of evaluation workshops that are offered at IPDET.*

Networking

- *Good networking and evaluation training as part of a large capacity building plan.(2)*
- *Definitely as it's a great chance for professionals to build knowledge and networking in evaluation.*
- *Costly bringing people from Africa. But its great having people form around the world and not just people from one region. It's important to share world experiences.*
- *In IPDET, not only will one's evaluation capacities be enhances but also one's*

- *personality and ability in teamwork across varied cultures.*
- *It provides a complete learning experience in a clean environment with friendly and competent people.*

Skills Building

- *It's great for building an evaluation framework.(2)*
- *It provides good knowledge for evaluation, is very much needed.*
- *Growing importance of evaluation in development, the need for knowledge about evaluation to be spread to donors and partners.*
- *You can't say you are a master of evaluation after just one course, but IPDET does provide basic evaluation skills and knowledge.*
- *Yes, fantastic. IPDET gave me confidence.*
- *Yes, because it allows the opportunity to learn and improve evaluation skills.*
- *Yes the new concepts, skills, networking and list serve were useful.*

Other

- *Yes, IPDET was also about how to do good research work not just about evaluations.*
- *It was a revision of methodology and foundations in new evaluation skills.(2)*
- *Yes, not just for evaluation, also for implementing projects as well.*
- *Unfortunately, funding is a problem. I produced a report for my organization to be able to get funding or support for other colleagues to go to IPDET.*

Maybe or No

- *Yes, I would recommend IPDET, it is a good start but a bit simplified and regimented.*
- *Yes, I would recommend the program; however, IPDET is very old school format. The lecture style and very World Bank focuses and it is not participatory and this was a general complaint I had.*
- *No, If you do go choose the workshops that apply directly to your work. The workshops are where I learned the most. It also depends on the ideology of the individual; the World Bank was pushing and reinforcing their ideas. There was no space for different types and alternative approaches in evaluation. Not a right based approach and it did not allow for a worldwide perspective.*

17) Do you have any further comments or suggestions?

Further Recommendations

- *Outcome Mapping, which was just a presentation at IPDET. I found it to be useful and would have liked more on this topic.*
- *The best way learning my doing. Important to ensure you have experts like the Evaluation Unit, who is attached to your project and who can come and train the group*

Thank you

- *Gratitude and appreciation for investing in me. You often need to focus on one person at a time. The importance of individual capacity building*

- *Thankful to IDRC for the opportunity.(2)*
- *I would like to thank IDRC for the scholarship and for the excellent IPDET experience.*
- *IPDET is an enriching experience*

Building local evaluation capacity

- *There was training in Uganda by IPDET, its important to have trainings in the region.*
- *There is a great need to strengthen local evaluation chapters*
- *Other ways of building evaluation capacity- one way is developing evaluation institutions and associations to offer local courses.*
- *In Palestine, the development process will depend on the donor community. Institutional evaluation capacity building is important.*
- *Being able to form a network to share success stories in my region.*
- *It would be useful, if there is training in Thailand or the Philippines on community development to share knowledge, case studies of success stories.*

Other

- *Being trained by the WB and having the name of IPDET has given me more opportunities. People are still impressed with the fact that it's WB.*
- *The second time I went back I had much more to contribute*
- *More hands on methodology to be taught at IPDET.*

Importance of building evaluation capacity

- *Great need for IDRC to build evaluation capacity and to continue to support individuals, NGO's.*
- *The EU really supports a lot of southern researchers from around the world in building evaluation skills.*
- *I suggest that IDRC keeps supporting IPDET and continues to stimulate partners and IDRC staff in the area of evaluation.*
- *It's a growing field and the importance there is a great importance with the growing network.*

APPENDIX G: Survey for IDRC-Sponsored IPDET Participants, 2006

IPDET Evaluation

The Evaluation Unit is evaluating the IDRC sponsored participants of the International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET). The purpose is to help improve the Centre's support to evaluation capacity building in the future. We value your input and perspective as an IPDET scholar.

Background

1) Name:

2) Gender: M ☐ F ☐

3) Country of citizenship:

4) Current Organization:

5a) During your participation at IPDET did you participate in the core course or the workshops?

Core course ☐ Workshops ☐ Both ☐

5b) If you participated in the workshops which workshops did you participate in?

6) Why did you choose to participate in the IPDET training?

Work History

7a) What best described your current role or position?

7b) Are you directly involved in evaluation activities with your organization?

Enriching Evaluation Capacity

8) Please tell us about any new skills and/or knowledge gained from your participation in the IPDET Training?

9) How do you intend to apply you new knowledge/skills in evaluation?

10) In your opinion, what else could the Evaluation Unit have done to enrich your experience before or during the IPDET program?

11) What level of evaluation experience would you suggest for future participants before they attend IPDET for the first time?

12) Would you recommend IPDET to other researchers? Yes ☐ No ☐
Why or why not?

Summary

13) Do you have any further comments or suggestions?

APPENDIX H: Survey Response for IDRC-Sponsored IPDET Participants, 2006

IPDET Evaluation

The Evaluation Unit is evaluating the IDRC sponsored participants of the International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET). The purpose is to help improve the Centre's support to evaluation capacity building in the future. We value your input and perspective as an IPDET scholar.

Background

Gender: M ☐ 3 F ☐ 1

Country of citizenship: Uganda, Chile, Colombia, Malaysia

Current Organization: Makerere University, Department of Geography, Chiloe Model Forest, Universidad de Antioquia. , (Facultad Nacional de Salud Pública), Global Knowledge Partnership Secretariat

5a) During your participation at IPDET did you participate in the core course or the workshops?

Core course ☐ Workshops ☐ Both ☐ x 4 (100%)

5b) If you participated in the workshops which workshops did you participate in?

6) Why did you choose to participate in the IPDET training?

Build evaluation Knowledge and skills

- *Acquire knowledge in evaluation.*
- *It was an opportunity to improve evaluation skills and learn the techniques of evaluation and monitoring*
- *How to evaluate the influence of the research and development activities on the community, participating team and institutions partnering.*

- *Knowing the theoretical basic and methodological skills of evaluation from the point of view of sponsors of development programs and projects*
- *I am interested in becoming more involved in evaluation of development programs and projects*
- *I will be involved in managing evaluations (TOR' s)*
- *It is important to implement a monitoring and evaluation system for improves the operations and to identify the lessons learned*

High quality of IPDET Course

- *IPDET is well known as a high quality evaluation course.*

Networking

- *It was also an opportunity to meet with other evaluators with many years of experience to share and exchange ideas.*

Work History

7a) What best described your current role or position?

Professor(x2)

- *I teach and supervise research at a university level at Makerere University. I also conduct research with interests in urban poverty, urban environment and vulnerability, land markets and livelihoods. Through research I have conducted an evaluation on Local Government Development Programs in reduction of urban poverty. On occasions, I work as a consultant for government and Civil Society Organizations in Uganda.*
- *Professor on issues related with planning and public health policies in postgraduate programs. Researcher on public health policies and social protection.*

General Manager

- *Chiloe Model Forest.*

Research Officer

- *Provide inputs and on issues, content development, as well as some level of administrative work*

7b) Are you directly involved in evaluation activities with your organization?

2 Yes 50% (n=2) No 50% (n=2)

Enriching Evaluation Capacity

8) Please tell us about any new skills and/or knowledge gained from your participation in the IPDET Training?

- *Designing and conducting evaluations.(4)*
- *Logic models (2)*
- *Participatory methods of evaluation.(3)*
- *Frameworks for evaluation*
- *Survey Design*
- *Networking in development evaluation*
- *Process, methods, techniques for evaluations of different programs (3)*

- *Scientific limitations of evaluating development.*
- *Holistic understanding of monitoring and evaluation*

9) How do you intend to apply you new knowledge/skills in evaluation?

- *To transfer the knowledge and skills to members of the project team, team, staff, partners and students especially the working group on Monitoring and Evaluation as a way of building the capacity.*
- *I will also be involved in internal evaluation where need exists*
- *Conducting surveys to members as well as surveys on events.*
- *Incorporating new knowledge and skills in the process of designing and conducting research in public health policies and social protection.*
- *I will use the knowledge in evaluating the Focus City project.*
- *Designing and implementing the project M&E system for programs and projects.*
- *There will be opportunities to practice evaluation skill in projects that will be implemented this year where it involves the distribution of funds.*

10) In your opinion, what else could the Evaluation Unit have done to enrich your experience before or during the IPDET program?

- *IDRC could organize at least one networking event to encourage cross-fertilization of ideas and knowledge sharing between the individuals from different projects.*
- *Continuing with the linkage between us and implementing evaluation systems in our places is the only way to better use the knowledge gained in the recent training.*
- *EU could design and implement a virtual working and studying group to exchange lessons before, during and after IPDET.*
- *I would like to maintain the link with IDRC Evaluation Unit to continue learning and sharing knowledge.*
- *A longer session at IDRC to discuss among the scholarship recipients and IDRC colleagues for a longer time.*
- *I will prepare evaluation designs, write TOR's and manage evaluations of the project*

11) What level of evaluation experience would you suggest for future participants before they attend IPDET for the first time?

- *Medium level - Basic requirements.*
- *Workshops – the evaluation experience does not really matter but the interest and relevance of the chosen workshop*
- *Professionals: Working in the early stage of a development program.*
- *The training provides the frameworks but the methodology, design types and tools are similar to the research methodology offered at University level education*

- *Core course – evaluation experience of a couple of years- is quite academic in nature, and a veteran evaluator might find the course boring as there is not much opportunity to discuss and exchange of ideas during class.*

12) Would you recommend IPDET to other researchers? Yes ☐ No ☐

- **Yes 100% (n=4)**

Why or why not?

- *Opportunity to learn (2)*
- *Form global networks (2)*
- *Share experiences*
- *Builds self-confidence*
- *High quality course*
- *High profile professors*
- *Different approach*
- *Concentrate in a relatively short time at a high level of knowledge and discussion.*
- *Very comprehensive course*
- *Good reading materials and case studies*
- *Experiences on evaluation from many countries around the world*

Summary

13) Do you have any further comments or suggestions?

- *Thank you very much for your support and friendly welcome. my appreciation for the support towards my participation at IPDET*
- *Rare opportunity of establishing networks and friends from many countries with whom exchange is already underway*
- *I am sure this program enhanced my theoretical framework and my capacity to design and conducting evaluation of development programs and projects.*
- *It would be additionally beneficial if evaluation training is also provided for University academics so that capacity is built around mainstreaming evaluation into curricula. This would offer future participants and IDRC partners some of whom are drawn from University and research institutions prior knowledge about evaluation*
- *I appreciate very much the support for participants involved in IDRC projects. It is expected that this is a way to enhance the quality and effectiveness of the projects we are conducting.*

APPENDIX I: Survey for IDRC Sponsors

As you may recall from the letter you were sent: The Evaluation Unit is conducting a tracer study of IDRC sponsored participants of the International Program for Development Evaluation Training (IPDET). You sponsored a project partner for the program and we would like to receive feedback from you on the outcome of the training. Your input and perspectives will help improve the Evaluation Unit's support of evaluation capacity building in the future. A more extensive survey will be conducted with each of the IPDET scholars. You will be provided with a copy of the final report for your information and comment. The questionnaire will involve 8 questions and should take approximate a 15 minutes interview.

Background on Your IPDET Participant

1) I would like to start the interview by focusing on your experience with supporting X's involvement in IPDET IN 200_?

2) Why did you recommend X for IPDET training?

a) Why do you feel that the IPDET training is important?

3) Since IPDET, can you describe any particular instances where (the participant) has applied their monitoring and evaluation skills or knowledge?

**4) Would you nominate other partners for IPDET training? (Yes or No)
Why or why not?**

5) In your opinion, what else could the Evaluation Unit do to improve the IPDET experience?

a) How can the EU improve the administration of the IPDET program?

Building Evaluation Capacity

As the Evaluation Unit will continue to support evaluation capacity building with partners, I'd like to take this opportunity to ask you some general questions about what you think would be helpful.

6) In your opinion, how do you think evaluation capacity complements research?

7) Do you have any suggestions for other activities the EU could undertake to help build evaluation capacity with your partners?

8) Do you have any further comments or suggestions?

APPENDIX J: Survey Results for IDRC Sponsors

Background on Your IPDET Participant

1) I would like to start the interview by focusing on your experience with supporting X's involvement in IPDET IN 200_?

2) Why did you recommend X for IPDET training?

Building evaluation capacity

- *I wanted people from an Asia project because (IDRC) has previous started up an M&E component in there Model Forest Project.*
- *As a project coordinator it is important for him to have some monitoring and evaluation so the research he was doing was well cataloged and organized and offered critical reflection.*
- *They were all working for the Kenyan Government and there was a lack of individuals with skills in evaluation*
- *We were trying to devolve capacity to other individuals in institutions*
- *As part of the project, there was a training and needs analysis. Each person they worked with they have had a capacity building focus on for training needs. They identified their training needs, skills, and own interest in terms of different types of capacity building.*
- *To identify projects with an active process of involvement with different stakeholders and where there was a need for capacity building and where better planning and implementation of evaluation was needed.*
- *He was involved in institutional evaluation of how policy and decision making is made in the mining sector in Equator. How policy makers are assessing the process of how policy is developed and implemented. Providing evaluations tools for the project would be helpful.*

No evaluation skills

- *We needed someone with evaluation skills to provide guidance in the project.*
- *No systematic use of evaluation tools within the project..*
- *He had never done project work and was right out of university. IPDET was necessary for him, to allow him to understand how to approach and what to assess in the project.*
- *He was part of an E government task team for a strategy. There was no M& E strategy for the entire project. It was useful for him to take the course and to be able to add an M&E strategy into the program from the inside.*

Outcome Mapping

- *Specifically if there was an Outcome Mapping component in the project, where individuals had no previous experience.(2)*
- *They did a big training 6 months prior (OM training) and saw IPDET as an opportunity to broaden participant's knowledge in Monitoring and Evaluation.*
- *They were in charge of coordination the implementation of OM in the their projects.*

Other

- To strengthen IDRC's EcoHealth and Governance Equity and Health partners ability in building a participatory component in projects.
- *They were looking for a training program, to provide capabilities to individuals and to the project. IDRC sent around a note and as it was recommended as a useful program, he therefore took advantage of the offer.*
- *I ask project partner who they would recommend from their organizations.*
- *There was nothing specific about why they sent these two individuals. We could have sent many people but felt they would benefited most*
- Each of these individuals had a relevant goal in the project, not just a marginal role.

a) Why do you feel that the IPDET training is important?

Develop skills

- *To link in new ideas and an opportunity to network and to learn more then what I could teach them.*
- *It offered an opportunity to be able to broaden the skill base in evaluation.*
- *IPDET exposes individuals to different approaches, methodologies and groups at the same level in a multicultural setting. All elements of the training help with the criteria for learning.*
- *I felt IPDET would help strengthen skills and knowledge of M and E and help with future career growth.*
- *The focus on evaluation as a tool and learning process and is being identified as a weakness in many of the projects.*
- *Evaluation is still as hierarchical and people just come in report. If you think carefully of a participatory M and E process you can improve capabilities of research team to work effectively towards goals and to eliminate bad practices and implement good one*
- *Empowering the research team with evaluation perspectives and strengthening evaluation capacity is very important.*

Offered new skills

- *To give the opportunity to be exposed to evaluation methodologies. This includes OM and other types of evaluation techniques and improve the work overall.*

To build capacity

- *Realized that there was a need for capacity building within the project.*
- *They needed in house evaluations skills to allow for the iteration of performance management criteria.*
- *The project has a lack of evaluation capacity.*
- *Having a person in the core team with training is very useful to enhance the project.*
- *Its essential to have evaluation skills, within the work a lot of time focused discussing proposals and the methodologies and implementation of monitoring*

3) Since IPDET, can you describe any particular instances where (the participant) has applied their monitoring and evaluation skills or knowledge?

Outcome Mapping

- *Go to IPDET to get a broad overview of OM and then they have the specific training in OM. Multi prong influence about OM, coming from different sources. Other types of methodologies its hard to tell if they applied other type.*
- *He applied OM and has now mainstreamed into all his projects.*
- *Through the entire project she used OM and even help published about their use of OM in the project.*
- *Was actively used OM in a workshop and monitoring, collection of data of the project.*
- *Listed in the final report, which spoke of the use of OM and outcomes of the project*
- *He started to use evaluation skills and Outcome Mapping.*

Combination of skills

- *Not sure if it's directly related to IPDET or a combination of IPDET and other trainings*

Implementing projects

- *She works at the national level and has brought some of the IPDET training into her work. (3)*
- *They are continuing to make amendments to (Performance Measurement Criteria) in the project and it's been very useful having someone in house to make changes.*
- *The importance of M and E in the project is iterative and she has the skills and knowledge to provides the expertise.*
- *IPDET training was positive in strengthening activities and use of participatory monitoring of environmental and health conditions in community and the national level with other stakeholders and at the international level.*
- *She used a number of different approaches and used direct reference to these skills from IPDET. She improved her own work and applied skills to the projects which she worked.*
- *She has been actively involved with the IPDET network.*
- *She has worked with the Evaluation Unit and with other organizations in Latin America.*
- *She has now been contracted by a number of organizations as a consultant to help with different techniques and advice on M&E.*

Nothing

- *He left the project but he thinks his skills are being used in other projects.*
- *I have not followed them closely and have not seen the direct effects.*
- *He was moved on to another position in another ministry. It was shame because they needed him in the project with his newfound skills, and he was relocated. Have not spoken to them in about a year.*

4) Would you nominate other partners for IPDET training? (Yes or No)

100% yes.

Why or why not?

Quality of the course

- *It is an intensive its one course which offers evaluation expertise in M&E.*
- *Important for individuals to see the different kinds of methodologies and ways to conduct and designing evaluation. (3)*
- *They found the ability to be able to present their projects as key. To have critical feedback from peer group was very important*
- *Its importance to broaden individuals understanding of M&E. So many tools and methodologies and experiences.(2)*

Networking

- *The networking opportunity was very important*
- *More international expose for partners is important and for them to attend these evaluation trainings.*
- *Community of practice and open exchange for lessons learned around evaluation is important*
- *You are in an environment with people from different organizations and from around the world.*

Challenges

- *The course was challenging and language was a challenge*
- *IPDET is good but 2 or 4 weeks is too much.*
- *The only downfall is the expense. Although there are scholarships provided, still significant expense. But the positives still outweigh the financial costs.*

Timing

- *Nominate people who need the evaluation training. Either currently involved in evaluation or a guarantee that they will use their evaluation training after returning from the project.*
- *Yes, but important to nominate partners who are at the proposal level or high probability of the funding the project or at the very beginning of the project*

Other

- *Not aware of other types of these course in the region.*
- *There is a continual need to build M&E experience and capabilities in the region.*
- *Researchers don't have occasions or opportunity for capacity at senior levels for evaluation training.*

5) In your opinion, what else could the Evaluation Unit do to improve the IPDET experience?

- *Importance for them to have the opportunity to meet with staff from the Evaluation Unit.*
- *Evaluation is doing a useful job. There needs to be a more articulated interface between attendance to the course and participants role in their project.*
- *The Evaluation Unit could ensure some type of network post course process to ensure there is a community of practice.*
- *Follow up on the results and application of M&E of the course with participants after. (2)*
- *Articulate their interest and intent in strengthening the project before in the form of a proposal.*
- *Need to make sure that there are real life examples not just theory as does not meet the practicality. Needs to be dynamic not static and meet the needs of participants.*

a) How can the EU improve the administration of the IPDET program?

No problems

- *No problems with the organization very simple and everything was dealt with by IPDET*
- *Little time and mad rush to get their application in. But its a competitive process and recognized that only some will be chosen.*
- *The process was fine no problems. All through email and excellent*
- *Nomination process went well with no problems easy and quick. In hindsight, to double check that people they have nominated, that they are they sure of. Maybe to ensure that the people you are sending are ready to go. Are they mentally prepared for the course.*

Problems

- *We had problems with the administration on the IPDET side. It was a specific case with certain circumstances. It's important that the terms and conditions are clear from the outset of the award. The regional office is better informed in order to our partners.*

Building Evaluation Capacity

As the Evaluation Unit will continue to support evaluation capacity building with partners, I'd like to take this opportunity to ask you some general questions about what you think would be helpful.

6) In your opinion, how do you think evaluation capacity complements research?

Planning tool

- *Enhancing evaluation capacity is also useful project planning and design and ongoing assessment of activities and to improve their success in projects.*
- *Opportunity to plan and think out project plan, evaluation is a very important planning tool not just assessment*
- *Evaluation is part of the research process. Evaluation allows you to ask the questions of are we moving forward, what I know and what I need to focus on.*
- *It strengthens capacity to be able to do monitoring and evaluation and to encourage good practice.*
- *Now we incorporate evaluations early on at the mid point and endpoint to assess project. No longer just at the end and now very useful.*
- *Research is a design in which you try to go to the field to implement. Evaluation helps linking the design to the actual. Many of the evaluation questions are the same sorts of questions, which researchers need to ask and use. In terms of are the right questions being asked?*
- *The Evaluation Unit has developed important tools, for example OM. Which provides better planning in a project and outcomes of a project and to monitor.*

Learning

- *OM now is being much more used and trained. It's become of great interest. OM offers a number of different tools and a paradigm shift. It's not always applicable. EU offers a number of different methodology not just OM*
- *Projects in Africa, often people don't have the evaluation training. Evaluation*

capacity building allows individuals to give a greater understanding and overview of the situation.

Other

- *Evaluation capacity is a complementary approach, which allows you to close the loop.*
- *If you don't monitor or evaluate you may find research irrelevant or not as relevant as it needs to be. Cyclical process to ensure that research is being evaluated.*
- *Critical for research and evaluation to be relevant to the beneficiaries.*

7) Do you have any suggestions for other activities the EU could undertake to help build evaluation capacity with your partners?

- *More trainings in the regions is important. Taking the show on the road rather than Ottawa. (3)*
- *Centres of Excellence and nodes that will provide OM training in the region is key.*
- *Support the creation of the African Gender and Development Evaluation Network; these are skilled evaluators in Africa. Florence would like to create partnerships with this network with the Evaluation Unit*
- *Share experiences of evaluations that people have gone through.*
- *Taylor it too a specific needs of the organization for evaluation training.*
- *Trying to use one person in the region as an evaluation resources person for the project.*
- *Move towards a more explicit strategy in how to add OM into projects.*
- *What and how needs to be evaluated and how to link it with training in evaluation.*

8) Do you have any further comments or suggestions?

Follow up

- *Glad to see that this survey is done to check to see how relevant and timely the course has been to its participants.*
- *Need for follow up, to be sure people are applying their skills.*
- *The importance of having a focus person in the EU. Someone who can familiar with the work of the PI. Follow up liaison with on an on going basis.*

Further training

- *In terms of direct results just going to IPDET is not enough.*

Other

- *Institutional assessment and OM for more trainings.(2)*
- *LACRO we recently used OM to organize internally for capacity building tasks for our administration and financial people.*
- *Evaluation is mainly intervening with program people in the regional offices. However, there is a clear role with regional controllers around evaluation. Regional Controllers are now involved with institutional assessments and responsibility for capacity building with recipients and financial aspects of the projects.*

Continue to support IPDET

- *Continue make these opportunities available. The scholarships are great idea. The training provides extra opportunity for individuals. (2)*
- *I have heard great things about the training. I would like to request if I could be sponsored to go to IPDET.*
- *Networking and knowledge sharing is important.*
- *Sending someone to IPDET was a learning process for us to find out the outcomes of what the course could do in terms of training for the individuals and for us.*

Concerns

- *IPDET is good but 2 or 4 weeks is too much.*
- *Large training becomes too general and watered down to accommodate the wide range of backgrounds and current work.*
- *The program is not tailored to each project group. Having one person coming in to train a specific group is very targeted and worthwhile. (2)*